

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 13-16 are pending.

Claims 1 and 16 are independent claims.

Reply to Objections

A new title was required. A new title has been provided. The Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the title.

Drawings

The indication that the drawings filed on November 2, 2004, have been approved is noted.

Restriction Requirement

On page 2, the Examiner required a restriction requirement. Actually, this a repeat of a previous restriction requirement and claim 6, drawn to a method of assembling a door, was cancelled in the last entered reply. Accordingly, no comments are considered necessary.

Reply to Rejections

First Rejection

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. To expedite prosecution, claim 12 has been cancelled and the rejection is now moot.

Second Rejection

Claims 1-4, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Okamoto et al. This rejection in view of the amendment to claim 1 is traversed.

Claim 1 now has the feature that the “inner panel has an inner edge” and that the “base plate has an inner edge in contact with the inner edge of the inner panel.” This feature is not shown in the reference applied and accordingly, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is not viable.

Even though claim 1 has been amended, the structure is not suggested by the reference applied. For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Third Rejection

Claims 1, 5, and 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakaguchi et al. This rejection in view of the amendment to claims 1 and 16 is traversed.

As explained above, claim 1 has been amended to claim a particular feature which is not shown either specifically or inherently in Sakaguchi et al. Accordingly, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is not viable.

Also, claim 16 has been amended and claims a feature not shown in the reference.

Additionally, there would be no motivation outside of the Applicant’s own disclosure to provide the structure claimed even though claims 1 and 16 have been amended.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Conclusion

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 and § 1.136(a), Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of two (2) month, to which a one (1) month extension has been previously paid for on May 17, 2005, in which to file a response to the outstanding Office Action. The required fee of \$330.00 is being paid concurrently with the filing of an RCE.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 23, 2005

By

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant